UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/590,197	11/27/2007	Arnaud Huignard	294729US0PCT	5542	
	7590 10/27/201 AK, MCCLELLAND I	EXAMINER			
1940 DUKE STREET			WIECZOREK, MICHAEL P		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1712			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/27/2011	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/590,197	HUIGNARD ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Michael Wieczorek	1712		

	Michael Wieczorek	1712					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 18 October 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee							
under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</li> <li>AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	v);	·					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or			he issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11		ected ciaims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphane / imonamone (					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 30-48. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>	before or on the date of filing a No I sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>							
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)13. Other:							
/Michael Wieczorek/	/Frederick J. Parker/						
Examiner, Art Unit 1712	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1715					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: 1. The amended claims will not be entered because the new limitations within parent claim 30 requiring that the sublayer is specifically silicon dioxide and that the activated surface of the etched sublayer has an RMS roughness of from a few nm to 30 nm alters the scope of the claims and thus would require further search and/or consideration. Furthermore, the applicant is advised that the new limitation of the RMS roughness being from a few nm to 30 would be rejected as being indefinite under 112 2nd paragraphs because the term "a few nm" is a relative term because the term is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments concerning the combination of Uemura and Okudaria are not persuasive because as was discussed in the previous Office Action Okudaria teaches known gases in the art for plasma etching of silicon dioxide layers as required by the method of Uemura. The fact that Okudaria etches an entire portion of the silicon dioxide layer had been removed by etching has not bearing on the combination with Uemura because Uemura teaches just etching the surface of the silicon dioxide sublayer to roughen the layer. Following the teachings of Uemura one of ordinary skill in the art would only perform the plasma treatment for a long enough period of time to only roughen the sublayer surface and not completely remove it. Furthermore, applicant's "unexpected" results presented within the specification are not persuasive because these results are not commensurate with the scope of the claims because the obtained results were only obtained for C2F6 while the amended and unentrered claims are for plasmas formed from either C2F6 of CF4.